

REMARKS

Please reconsider this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 7-16 were pending in the referenced application. New claims 17-20 have been added by way of this reply and are also pending. Claims 7, 10, 13, and 16 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 7, 10, 13, and 16.

Claim Amendments

Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 16 have been amended by way of this reply to clarify embodiments of the invention. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0007], [0059]-[0061] and [0072]-[0073] of the published specification. New claims 17-20 have been added by way of this reply. Support for new claims 17-20 may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0061] and [0073] of the published specification. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by way of these claim amendments.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

MPEP § 2143 states that “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious.” Further, the Supreme Court in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1739, 75 U.S.L.W. 4289 (2007) noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be made

explicit. *See* MPEP § 2143. The analysis presented by the Examiner to support the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in the Action indicates that the Examiner found no differences between the cited prior art and the claims besides a lack of the actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference, *i.e.*, that the Examiner is relying solely on the teachings of the prior art. *See, e.g.*, MPEP § 2143(A). Applicants respectfully assert that all of the elements of the amended claims are not found in the cited prior art.

Claims 7-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,682,285 (“Ozil”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,515,440 (“Mooney”). To the extent that this rejection applies to the pending claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 7 recites, in part, “wherein the protected device is configured to hash the message received from the message storage device and to send the message to the display device.” In making the rejection, the Examiner relies upon Ozil to disclose the protected device as recited by the pending claims. *See* page 3 lines 1-3 (citing Ozil’s coupling system: column 1 lines 39-65 and column 2 lines 54-66 of Ozil) and page 4 lines 10-14 of the Final OA. Applicant disagrees.

Ozil’s coupling system serves to facilitate data exchange between several processor devices and a peripheral device by way of a common system resource (*i.e.*, exchange bus or local bus). *See* Ozil: column 1 lines 39-65 and column 2 lines 54-66. Specifically, to promote connectivity among the several aforementioned devices, Ozil’s coupling system constitutes a microprocessor for determining whether the bus controller for a particular device may make use of a bus to send data. *See* Ozil: column 2 line 54 – column 3 line 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the microprocessor of Ozil’s coupling system merely coordinates data transmission between devices in

a system such that the appropriate device-specific bus controller is exclusively operative at a given time. Further, because Ozil's microprocessor at best routes the flow of data, Ozil is silent as to the microprocessor *hashing a message* received from a storage device as required by amended independent claim 7. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that Basin cannot be properly construed to disclose or render obvious the limitation of "wherein the protected device is configured to hash the message received from the message storage device and to send the message to the display device."

Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that Mooney fails to disclose or otherwise provide that which Ozil lacks. Mooney is directed to using a card reader interface to protect a computer system from unauthorized use. *See Mooney: column 2 lines 2-8.* Specifically, Mooney discloses a computer system reading a question from a smart card, displaying the question to the user, and receiving a response from the user. *See Mooney: column 5 lines 54-57.* Having received the user's response, the smart card performs a comparison of the user's response with a correct response stored on the smart card. *See Mooney: column 5 lines 57-62.* Applicant respectfully asserts that Mooney is silent as to any hashing of data performed in relation to the smart card (*i.e.*, protected device). Accordingly, Mooney cannot be properly construed to disclose or render obvious the limitation of "wherein the protected device is configured to hash the message received from the message storage device and to send the message to the display device."

In view of the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Ozil and Mooney fail to disclose or render obvious all the limitations recited by amended independent claim 7. For at least these reasons, amended independent claim 7 is patentable over Ozil and Mooney. Further, amended independent claims 10, 13, and 16 include at least the same limitations as

amended independent claim 7 and are therefore patentable over Ozil and Mooney for at least the same reasons provided with respect to amended independent claim 7. Dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Claims 17-20 have been added by way of this reply and are also currently pending. Claim 17 depends directly from independent claim 7 and therefore includes the same or similar patentable features as independent claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 17 is patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided with respect to independent claim 7. Claim 18 depends directly from independent claim 10 and therefore includes the same or similar patentable features as independent claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 18 is patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided with respect to independent claim 10. Claim 19 depends directly from independent claim 13 and therefore includes the same or similar patentable features as independent claim 13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 19 is patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided with respect to independent claim 13. Claim 20 depends directly from independent claim 16 and therefore includes the same or similar patentable features as independent claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 20 is patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons provided with respect to independent claim 16. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowability for all of the new claims.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 09669/009002).

Dated: November 17, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By / Jonathan P. Osha/
Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant